



Norman H. Bangerter
Governor

Dee C. Hansen
Executive Director

Dianne R. Nielson, Ph.D.
Division Director

State of Utah

DEPARTMENT OF NATURAL RESOURCES
DIVISION OF OIL, GAS AND MINING

355 West North Temple
3 Triad Center, Suite 350
Salt Lake City, Utah 84180-1203
801-538-5340

DOGM
MINERALS PROGRAM
FILE COPY

August 25, 1989

TO: Wayne Hedberg, Permit Lead

FROM: Holland Shepherd, Reclamation Soils Specialist *HWDS*

RE: Pine Canyon Final Reclamation Plan, Kennecott Minerals,
M/045/004, Tooele County, Utah

I have reviewed the Pine Canyon MRP, and have no comments in regard to the soil, revegetation or wildlife aspects of the plan. The plan is very thorough and well organized. It addresses all concerns I would have on the above subjects.

R613-004-111.2 & 4 - Drainages and Deleterious Materials

I spoke with Fred Snyder of Kennecott, over the phone on August 25, 1989, concerning water quality information and mine discharges. He indicated that he would attempt to obtain more historic water quality information pertaining to the Pine Canyon Portal and Production Shaft. He also indicated that he would look into the possibility of allowing water to discharge via the Pine Canyon Production Shaft vs. into Bingham Canyon. I indicated I thought this to be a more productive use of the water.

R613-004-111.8 - Roads Reclamation

The operator wants to leave the access road, up through the canyon, intact, for postmine usage. This requires a variance from our rules, which I support.

R613-004-111.9 - Dams and Impoundments

The operator wants to leave the existing reservoir intact for postmine use. This might have to be cleared with Water Rights - Dam Safety before a variance is approved.

Page 2
Pine Canyon
Kennecott Minerals
August 25, 1989

R613-004-111.11 - Variance Facilities Reclamation

1. The operator has requested a variance from reclaiming the Pine Canyon Production Shaft Head Frame and Shaft. The operator indicates that the Head Frame and Shaft will be sealed off from the public and to animals, and that it is sound enough to stand on its own indefinitely. I suggest we discuss this variance as a team.
2. The operator wants to leave the warehouse and truck shop intact for commercial use and postmine landuse. This would require a variance from our rules, which I support.
3. The operator has asked to leave the water tank and access area for postmine use. This will require a variance, which I support.

jb
MN4/166-167